

JOURNAL

OF THE

New York Entomological Society.

EDITED BY HARRISON G. DYAR.

Publishes articles relating to any class of the subkingdom Arthropoda, subject to the acceptance of the Publication Committee. Original communications in this field are solicited.

EDITORIAL.

The article by Mr. Busck published in the March number (Journ. N. Y. Ent. Soc., xv, 19-36, 1907) was first issued as author's separates on Feb. 7, and his new species should be credited with that date.

The Entomological Society of America met in New York during the session of the American Association for the Advancement of Science and successfully organized. We have expressed our belief that this society is unnecessary, yet as it has supplanted the Entomological Club by a stronger association, we feel now more reconciled to its existence. We shall await with interest to see if it shall serve any further useful purpose. Any such is at present rather obscure to us.

The question of the rule for selecting types of genera is further treated by Mr. Witmer Stone (Science, n. s., xxiv, 560, 1906) and Mr. D. W. Coquillett (Science, n. s., xxv, 308, 1907). Mr. Stone argues ably for the first species method, while Mr. Coquillett pronounces against it. Mr. Coquillett's article is written with a naive air of final judgment, yet it exhibits a singular confusion of thought. The "elimination method" is approved, yet it is perfectly evident from his remarks that it is not the elimination method that Mr. Coquillett has in mind at all, but a strongly opposed method, namely

that of the nomination of types. This method is as different from the elimination method in its results as the first species method is. Mr. Coquillett is further confused by the idea that there is a right and a wrong way of selecting types. In fact, these terms are not applicable, every method of type selection being essentially arbitrary and a question of rule; the matter is only one of expediency. The elimination method has proved its utter inexpediency; the nomination of types is far better, largely eliminating the personal equation, but still objectional from the amount of otherwise profitless search involved; the first species method is by far the simplest and most expedient. Our present rules are so extremely elastic that they allow almost any method of procedure *except* the first species method. It is high time that they were amended and made definite on the only definite expedient method, that of the first species.

Since writing the above, we have read the article by President David Starr Jordan (*Science*, n. s., xxv, 467, 1907) favoring the first species rule. We are in complete accord with his conclusions, and cannot imagine why they should not similarly appeal to everybody.

We have been recently rather shocked by the attitude of so eminent an authority as Professor S. W. Williston on this subject. Having supposed that the only important matter requiring adjustment was the establishment of the first species method, it is a distinct surprise to find the generic type itself in doubt. Professor Williston writes: "I am unalterably opposed to any law of 'types,' and shall never recognize such myself. I consider a genus as something more than a specimen, and am decidedly opposed to any law which permits the ignorant amateur to shield himself back of a type, throwing upon some one else the burden of distinguishing generic characters. Any species that an author uses in defining a genus is equally a type if he chooses to so consider it, and it devolves upon the one who 'splits' the genus to show the differences and leave the residue to bear the original name. This is the view I have always had; it has been the practice of all dipterologists, until recently at least, and it doubtless will be their practice in the future. I do not think that rules promulgated by . . . any one . . . will abolish the custom, at least not unless some such commission as Davenport has recently suggested (a consummation devoutly to be wished) is established."